

- 3 -

Remarks/Argument

The Applicant has amended the claims to clearly show the differences between the invention and the prior art. In particular, claim 1, as amended, includes the limitations that the lip mount has a padded underside and the motor is supported by the lip mount and cover. Claim 1 now includes the limitations of previous claims 4 and 6.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ono (U.S. Patent No. 4,596,779). Claims 3 to 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ono.

Ono does not include the limitation that the lip mount and cover support the motor. As seen in Figure 1 of Ono, the motor is supported by housing 14, which is positioned on a surface between vessels 40. An advantage of the present invention over Ono is that it is suitable for containers positioned in close proximity whereas the vessel and agitator disclosed in Ono require additional surface space beyond that taken up by the containers.

The padding on the underside of the lip mount assists the lip mount and cover to support the motor, which can be quite heavy.

Given the above, the Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

This response includes a request for a two-month extension of time, until February 8, 2006, for responding to the Office Action. Fees for this extension (\$225.00) may be charged to the Attorney's Deposit Account No. 07-2519, along with any other fees deemed necessary in connection with this or any accompanying paper.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Paul A. Guss (Reg. No. 33,099)
Paul A. Guss Attorney at Law
775 S 23rd Street, First Floor, Suite 2
Arlington, VA 22202